arXiv:1412.6715v2 [quant-ph] 5 Mar 2015

Social optimality in quantum Bayesian games

Azhar Iqbal, James M. Chappell, Derek Abbott
School of Electrical & Electronic Engineering, the University of Adelaide,
South Australia 5005, Australia.

Abstract

A significant aspect of the study of quantum strategies is the exploration of the game-theoretic solution concept of the Nash equilibrium in relation to the quantization of a game. Pareto optimality is a refinement on the set of Nash equilibria. A refinement on the set of Pareto optimal outcomes is known as *social optimality* in which the sum of players' payoffs are maximized. This paper analyzes social optimality in a Bayesian game that uses the setting of generalized Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen experiments for its physical implementation. We show that for the quantum Bayesian game a direct connection appears between the violation of Bell's inequality and the social optimal outcome of the game and that it attains a superior socially optimal outcome.

1 Introduction

The probabilistic approach to the area of quantum games [1–64] shows how quantum probabilities can result in non-classical outcomes that defy intuition. Without referring directly to the mathematical machinery of quantum mechanics, this approach shows how a game-theoretic setting can benefit from quantum probabilities obtained from quantum mechanical experiments. As classical probabilities, quantum probabilities are normalized but they also obey other constraints that are dictated by the rules of quantum mechanics. Our earlier studies [58, 59] have investigated coevolution [65] in quantum games and also developing a probabilistic approach to quantum games [24, 48, 50, 60]. The solution concept of the Nash equilibrium (NE) from non-cooperative game theory [66–68] has been studied from the outset of the field of quantum game theory. Named after John Nash, it consists of a set of strategies, one for each player, such that no player is left with the incentive to unilaterally change her action. Players are in equilibrium if the change in strategies by any one of them would lead that player to earn less than if she remained with her current strategy.

For a physical system used in implementing a quantum game, one usually considers violation of Bell's inequality in relation to the outcome of the game as represented by the concept of a NE. In almost all cases of interest within the area of quantum game theory, one notices that Bell's inequality violation may only be indirectly proportional to the NE (or equilibria) of the game. The question then arises whether there exist other solution concepts for which the mentioned connection becomes a direct proportionlity. In the present paper, it is shown that when one considers a particular refinement of the NE concept, a direct connection can indeed be established between Bell's inequality and the outcome of the game as represented by that refinement.

Pareto optimality is a refinement on the set of Nash equilibria. An outcome of a game is Pareto optimal if there is no other outcome that makes every player at least as well off and at least one player strictly better off. That is, a Pareto optimal outcome cannot be improved upon without disadvantaging at least one player. Quite often, a NE is not Pareto optimal implying that players' payoffs can all be increased. For the Prisoners' Dilemma game, it is well known that the NE is not Pareto optimal.

A stronger refinement of the NE concept, which is even simpler to state, is known as *social optimality* [69]. It is a choice of strategies, one by each player, which is a social welfare maximizer as it maximizes the sum of the players' payoffs. Of course, this definition is only appropriate to

the extent that it makes sense to add the payoffs of different players together. Maximizing the sum of players' payoff may not necessarlily lead to the satisfaction of all the participating players.

As the Pareto optimal outcome is a refinement on the set of NE, the outcomes that are socially optimal must also be Pareto optimal. If such an outcome were not Pareto optimal, there would be a different outcome in which all payoffs were at least as large, and one was larger. This would be an outcome with a larger sum of payoffs. On the other hand, a Pareto optimal outcome need not be socially optimal and a NE may not be socially optimal even though it can be Pareto optimal. However, a socially optimal outcome is always Pareto optimal.

In an earlier work [60] we have studied the solution concept of a Bayesian Nash equilibrium using a probabilistic approach to quantum games [24, 48, 50, 60]. In the present paper, we study how quantum probabilities can result in a different outcome for the solution concept of social optimality in a Bayesian game. We notice that with this refinement of the NE concept, a direct connection appears between violation of CHSH form of Bell's inequality [70, 77, 78] and the social optimal outcome of the Bayesian game.

2 Social optimality in a Bayesian game

The decision-makers in a strategic game are called players who are endowed with a set of actions. In a Bayesian game [66–68] the players have incomplete information about the other players' payoffs i.e. the payoffs are not common knowledge. Incomplete information means that at least one player does not know someone else's payoffs. Random values are assigned to the players that take values of *types* for each player and probabilities are associated to those types. A player's payoff function is determined by his/her type and the probability associated with that type. Examples include auctions in which bidders do not know each others' valuations and bargaining processes in which another player's discout factor is unknown. The game of Battle of the Sexes [68] when one does not know if the other prefers to be alone or go on a date provides a clearer exposition of a social dilemma that can be analysed using the theory of Bayesian games. More formally [67,68], a Bayesian game consists of players and states. Each player has a set of actions, a set of signals that the player may receive, and a signal function that associates a signal with each state. Consider the following Bayesian game



Table 1. A Bayesian game of incomplete information.

in which there are four states represented by four rectangular boxes. As can be noted, each state is a complete description of one collection of the players' relevant characteristics. Players do not observe the state and instead receive signals that provide them information about the state. The signal functions [68] map states into players' types. For the game in Table 1, the players Alice and Bob both have two types that we call type 1 and type 2.

As the Table 1 shows, for Alice of either type, Bob is found to be one of the two types with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. Similarly, for Bob of either type, Alice is found to be one of her two types with the probability $\frac{1}{2}$. The payoffs to Alice and Bob of each type is given in the Table 1. For instance, from the Table 1. The payoff matrix describing the interaction between Alice of type 2 and Bob of type 1 is given as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \text{Bob of type 1} \\ & & \begin{array}{cc} B & S \end{array} \\ \text{Alice of type 2} & \begin{array}{c} B \\ S \end{array} & \left(\begin{array}{cc} (1,1) & (0,0) \\ (0,0) & (1,1) \end{array} \right). \end{array} \tag{1}$$

The normal form representation of this Bayesian game is obtained in Table 2 below

		Strategies for Bob's two types			
		(B,B)	(B,S)	(S,B)	(S,S)
Strategies for Alice's two types	(B,B)	$(1,\frac{1}{2}),(1,\frac{1}{2})$	$(\frac{1}{2},1),(1,\frac{1}{2})$	$(\frac{1}{2},0),(0,\frac{1}{2})$	$(0,\frac{1}{2}),(0,\frac{1}{2})$
	(B,S)	$(1,\frac{1}{2}),(\frac{1}{2},1)$	$(\frac{1}{2},0),(\frac{1}{2},0)$	$(\frac{1}{2},1),(\frac{1}{2},1)$	$(0,\frac{1}{2}),(\frac{1}{2},0)$
	(S,B)	$(0,\frac{1}{2}),(\frac{1}{2},0)$	$(\frac{1}{2},1),(\frac{1}{2},1)$	$(\frac{1}{2},0),(\frac{1}{2},0)$	$(1,\frac{1}{2}),(\frac{1}{2},1)$
	(S,S)	$(0,\frac{1}{2}),(0,\frac{1}{2})$	$(\frac{1}{2},0),(0,\frac{1}{2})$	$(\frac{1}{2},1),(1,\frac{1}{2})$	$(1,\frac{1}{2}),(1,\frac{1}{2})$

Table 2. A normal form representation of the Bayesian game of Table 1.

where, the entries in parentheses on left column are pure strategies for Alice's two types, respectively. Similarly, the entries in parentheses in the top row are pure strategies for Bob's two types, respectively. For the two pairs of payoff entries, the first pair is for Alice's two types and the second payoff pair is for Bob's two types.

For instance, in Table 2 above consider the entry $(\frac{1}{2},1),(\frac{1}{2},1)$ that corresponds when the strategy of Alice's two types is (S,B) and the strategy of Bob's two types is (B,S). Here, understandably, the first entry in the braces is the strategy of either player of type 1. Now we refer to Table 1 and notice how Table 2 is obtained from Table 1. At the intersection of the two rows representing the strategies of S, B, played by Alice's first and second types, respectively, and the two columns representing the strategies of S, B, played by Alice's first and second types, respectively, we find the following entries

$$\begin{array}{lcc} & \text{Bob's first type: } B & \text{Bob's second type: } S \\ \text{Alice's first type: } S & (0,0) & (1,1) \\ \text{Alice's second type: } B & (1,1) & (1,1) \end{array}, \tag{2}$$

from which the payoff to Alice's first type is obtained as $\frac{1}{2}(0)+\frac{1}{2}(1)=\frac{1}{2}$ and the payoff to Alice's second type is obtained as $\frac{1}{2}(1)+\frac{1}{2}(1)=1$. Similarly, the payoff to Bob's first type is obtained as $\frac{1}{2}(0)+\frac{1}{2}(1)=\frac{1}{2}$ whereas the payoff to Bob's second type is obtained as $\frac{1}{2}(1)+\frac{1}{2}(1)=1$. The other payoffs in Table 2 can similarly be obtained from Table 1.

2.1 Mixed-strategy version

Consider now the mixed-strategy version of this game in which the players' probabilities of selecting B from the pure strategies B & S are given by numbers p, q, p', and $q' \in [0,1]$ for Alice of type 1, Alice of type 2, Bob of type 1, and for Bob of type 2, respectively. The mixed-strategy payoffs for Alice's and Bob's two types is then obtained from Table 1 as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{\mathrm{A}_1}(p,q;p',q') &= \tfrac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ 1-p \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p' \\ 1-p' \end{pmatrix} + \tfrac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ 1-p \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} q' \\ 1-q' \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Pi_{\mathrm{A}_2}(p,q;p',q') &= \tfrac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} q \\ 1-q \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p' \\ 1-p' \end{pmatrix} + \tfrac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} q \\ 1-q \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} q' \\ 1-q' \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Pi_{\mathrm{B}_1}(p,q;p',q') &= \tfrac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ 1-p \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p' \\ 1-p' \end{pmatrix} + \tfrac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} q \\ 1-q \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p' \\ 1-p' \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Pi_{\mathrm{B}_2}(p,q;p',q') &= \tfrac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ 1-p \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} q' \\ 1-q' \end{pmatrix} + \tfrac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} q \\ 1-q \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} q' \\ 1-q' \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{3}
$$

where T is for transpose and the subscripts 1 and 2 under A and B refer to the respective player's type. Also, a semicolon is used to separate Alice's and Bob's strategic variables p, q and p', q', respectively.

Referring to how p, q, p', q' are defined above, the strategies of the Alice's two types are (B, B), (B, S), (S, B), (S, S) and these can be written as $(p, q) = (1, 1)$, $(1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, $(0, 0)$, respectively. Likewise, the strategies of Bob's two types are (B, B), (B, S), (S, B), (S, S) and can be written as $(p', q') = (1, 1)$, $(1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, $(0, 0)$, respectively. Substituting these in the mixed-strategy payoffs (3) the entries of the normal form representation of the game in Table 2 can then be obtained.

3 Social optimality in factorizable Bayesian game

In order to introduce quantum probabilities in this game, we note that mixed-strategy payoff relations (3) can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{\mathrm{A}_1}(p,q;p',q') &= \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(1)\epsilon_1 + (0)\epsilon_2 + (0)\epsilon_3 + (1)\epsilon_4\right] + \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(1)\epsilon_5 + (0)\epsilon_6 + (0)\epsilon_7 + (1)\epsilon_8\right], \\
\Pi_{\mathrm{A}_2}(p,q;p',q') &= \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(1)\epsilon_9 + (0)\epsilon_{10} + (0)\epsilon_{11} + (1)\epsilon_{12}\right] + \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(0)\epsilon_{13} + (1)\epsilon_{14} + (1)\epsilon_{15} + (0)\epsilon_{16}\right], \\
\Pi_{\mathrm{B}_1}(p,q;p',q') &= \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(1)\epsilon_1 + (0)\epsilon_2 + (0)\epsilon_3 + (1)\epsilon_4\right] + \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(1)\epsilon_9 + (0)\epsilon_{10} + (0)\epsilon_{11} + (1)\epsilon_{12}\right], \\
\Pi_{\mathrm{B}_2}(p,q;p',q') &= \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(1)\epsilon_5 + (0)\epsilon_6 + (0)\epsilon_7 + (1)\epsilon_8\right] + \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(0)\epsilon_{13} + (1)\epsilon_{14} + (1)\epsilon_{15} + (0)\epsilon_{16}\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{4}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
&pp' = \epsilon_1,\ p(1-p') = \epsilon_2,\ (1-p)p' = \epsilon_3,\ (1-p)(1-p') = \epsilon_4, \\
&pq' = \epsilon_5,\ p(1-q') = \epsilon_6,\ (1-p)q' = \epsilon_7,\ (1-p)(1-q') = \epsilon_8, \\
&qp' = \epsilon_9,\ q(1-p') = \epsilon_{10},\ (1-q)p' = \epsilon_{11},\ (1-q)(1-p') = \epsilon_{12}, \\
&qq' = \epsilon_{13},\ q(1-q') = \epsilon_{14},\ (1-q)q' = \epsilon_{15},\ (1-q)(1-q') = \epsilon_{16}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}
$$

The set of factorizable probabilities ϵ_i $(1 \leq i \leq 16)$ satisfies the normalization constraint as described below

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{4}\epsilon_i = 1,\ \sum_{i=5}^{8}\epsilon_i = 1,\ \sum_{i=9}^{12}\epsilon_i = 1,\ \sum_{i=13}^{16}\epsilon_i = 1. \tag{6}
$$

To find the Socially Optimal outcome of this game, we consider the sum of players' payoffs and find its maximum i.e.

$$
\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(p,q;p',q') = \Pi_{\mathrm{A}_1}(p,q;p',q') + \Pi_{\mathrm{A}_2}(p,q;p',q') + \Pi_{\mathrm{B}_1}(p,q;p',q') + \Pi_{\mathrm{B}_2}(p,q;p',q'). \tag{7}
$$

From Eqs. (4,5) we can write

$$\Pi_{\mathrm{A}_1}(p,q;p',q') = (p'+q')(p-\tfrac{1}{2}) + (1-p),\ \Pi_{\mathrm{A}_2}(q;p',q') = (p'-q')(q-\tfrac{1}{2}) + \tfrac{1}{2},$$
$$\Pi_{\mathrm{B}_1}(p,q;p',q') = (p+q)(p'-\tfrac{1}{2}) + (1-p'),\ \Pi_{\mathrm{B}_2}(p,q;q') = (p-q)(q'-\tfrac{1}{2}) + \tfrac{1}{2}, \tag{8}$$

whose sum can be expressed as

$$\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(p,q;p',q') = 2q'(p-q) + 2p'(p+q-\tfrac{1}{2}) - 2p + 3. \tag{9}$$

Now, an edge solution refers to the end or edge values of the continuous variables p, q, p', q' within their allowed intervals that are $[0,1]$ for each. A 'non-edge' solution, however, is the quadruple $(p^*, q^*; p'^*, q'^*)$ that maximizes the sum $\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(p,q;p',q')$. We thus require

$$\left.\frac{\partial \Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}}{\partial p}\right|_* = 0,\ \left.\frac{\partial \Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}}{\partial q}\right|_* = 0,\ \left.\frac{\partial \Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}}{\partial p'}\right|_* = 0,\ \left.\frac{\partial \Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}}{\partial q'}\right|_* = 0, \tag{10}$$

where, for instance, $\left.\frac{\partial \Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}}{\partial p}\right|_*$ states that this expression is evaluated at $p = p^*$, $q = q^*$, $p' = p'^*$, $q' = q'^*$. We obtain

$$p^* = q^* = \tfrac{1}{2},\ p'^* = q'^* = \tfrac{1}{4}, \tag{11}$$

at which the sum of the payoffs becomes

$$\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(p^*, q^*; p'^*, q'^*) = \tfrac{5}{2}. \tag{12}$$

As can be noticed, the 'edge values' of the function $\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(p,q;p',q')$ can nevertheless achieve higher values than $\frac{5}{2}$. For instance, for $(p,q;p',q') = (0,0;0,0)$ we have $\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(p^*, q^*; p'^*, q'^*) = 3$ and for $(p,q;p',q') = (1,1;1,1)$ we have $\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(p^*, q^*; p'^*, q'^*) = 4$.

4 Social optimality in the Bayesian game with quantum probabilities

The above analysis of mixed-strategy Bayesian Nash equilibria is for the case when the underlying probabilities are factorizable. We now enquire whether there exists a different outcome of this Bayesian game when underlying probabilities are not subjected to the constraints of factorizability as described by Eqs. (5). For this we consider a set of quantum probabilities that are obtained from the generalized Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) experiments as such probabilities can become non-factorizable.

The setting of the generalized EPR experiments [70–79] involves preparation of a maximally entangled quantum state of pairs of photons. In each run, two halves of an EPR pair originating from the same source travel in the opposite directions. One half of EPR pair is received by the observer Alice whereas the other half is received by Bob. Players Alice and Bob are assumed to be located in space-like separated regions and are unable to communicate.

In a run, Alice can measure the spin of her half of an EPR pair either along the D_1 direction or along the D_2 direction. In the same run, Bob can measure the spin of his half of the same EPR pair either along the D'_1 direction or along the D'_2 direction.

That is, in a run, a directional pair is chosen by the players that is from $(D_1,\ D'_2)$, (D_1, D'_1), (D_2, D'_1), (D_2, D'_2). An EPR experiment involves rotating a Stern-Gerlach detector along the chosen directional pair and performing the quantum measurement. Independent of a directional pair that is chosen by the players in a run, the outcome of the quantum measurement is either $+1$ or -1 along any measurement direction for both Alice and Bob.

Corresponding to this experiment, one can then obtain a set of 16 probabilities that can be written as in Table 3 [79].

			Bob's two types			
			D_1'		D_2'	
			$+1$	-1	$+1$	-1
Alice's two types	D_1	$+1$	ε_1	ε_2	ε_5	ε_6
		-1	ε_3	ε_4	ε_7	ε_8
	D_2	$+1$	ε_9	ε_{10}	ε_{13}	ε_{14}
		-1	ε_{11}	ε_{12}	ε_{15}	ε_{16}

Table 3. The probabilities in the generalized EPR experiments. (13)

4.1 Probabilities in generalized EPR experiment

The elements of the probability set ε_j $(1 \leq j \leq 16)$ are known to satisfy certain other constraints that are described in the following. Note that when the directional pair $(D_1,\, D_2')$ is chosen for all runs of the experiment, the only possible outcomes are $(+1,+1)$, $(+1,-1)$, $(-1,+1)$, $(-1,-1)$. The same is true for other directional pairs (D_1, D_1'), (D_2, D_1'), (D_2, D_2'). This leads to the normalization constraint

$$\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{4}\varepsilon_j = 1 = \sum_{j=5}^{8}\varepsilon_j, \quad \sum_{j=9}^{12}\varepsilon_j = 1 = \sum_{j=13}^{16}\varepsilon_j. \tag{14}$$

Also, in a particular run of the EPR experiment, the outcome of $+1$ or -1 (obtained along the direction D_1 or direction D_2) is independent of whether the direction D_1' or the direction D_2' is chosen in that run. Similarly, the outcome of $+1$ or -1 (obtained along D_1' or D_2') is independent of whether the direction D_1 or the direction D_2 is chosen in that run. These requirements, when translated in terms of the probability set ε_j are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2=\varepsilon_5+\varepsilon_6, \quad \varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_3=\varepsilon_9+\varepsilon_{11}, \quad \varepsilon_9+\varepsilon_{10}=\varepsilon_{13}+\varepsilon_{14}, \quad \varepsilon_5+\varepsilon_7=\varepsilon_{13}+\varepsilon_{15},\\ &\varepsilon_3+\varepsilon_4=\varepsilon_7+\varepsilon_8, \quad \varepsilon_{11}+\varepsilon_{12}=\varepsilon_{15}+\varepsilon_{16}, \quad \varepsilon_2+\varepsilon_4=\varepsilon_{10}+\varepsilon_{12}, \quad \varepsilon_6+\varepsilon_8=\varepsilon_{14}+\varepsilon_{16}. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

A convenient solution of the system (14, 15) is reported by Cereceda [79] to be the one for which the set of probabilities $\upsilon = \{\varepsilon_2,\ \varepsilon_3,\ \varepsilon_6,\ \varepsilon_7,\ \varepsilon_{10},\ \varepsilon_{11},\ \varepsilon_{13},\ \varepsilon_{16}\}$ is expressed in terms of the remaining set of probabilities $\mu = \{\varepsilon_1,\ \varepsilon_4,\ \varepsilon_5,\ \varepsilon_8,\ \varepsilon_9,\ \varepsilon_{12},\ \varepsilon_{14},\ \varepsilon_{15}\}$ that is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_2 &= (1-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_4+\varepsilon_5-\varepsilon_8-\varepsilon_9+\varepsilon_{12}+\varepsilon_{14}-\varepsilon_{15})/2,\\ \varepsilon_3 &= (1-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_4-\varepsilon_5+\varepsilon_8+\varepsilon_9-\varepsilon_{12}-\varepsilon_{14}+\varepsilon_{15})/2,\\ \varepsilon_6 &= (1+\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_4-\varepsilon_5-\varepsilon_8-\varepsilon_9+\varepsilon_{12}+\varepsilon_{14}-\varepsilon_{15})/2,\\ \varepsilon_7 &= (1-\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_4-\varepsilon_5-\varepsilon_8+\varepsilon_9-\varepsilon_{12}-\varepsilon_{14}+\varepsilon_{15})/2,\\ \varepsilon_{10} &= (1-\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_4+\varepsilon_5-\varepsilon_8-\varepsilon_9-\varepsilon_{12}+\varepsilon_{14}-\varepsilon_{15})/2,\\ \varepsilon_{11} &= (1+\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_4-\varepsilon_5+\varepsilon_8-\varepsilon_9-\varepsilon_{12}-\varepsilon_{14}+\varepsilon_{15})/2,\\ \varepsilon_{13} &= (1-\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_4+\varepsilon_5-\varepsilon_8+\varepsilon_9-\varepsilon_{12}-\varepsilon_{14}-\varepsilon_{15})/2,\\ \varepsilon_{16} &= (1+\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_4-\varepsilon_5+\varepsilon_8-\varepsilon_9+\varepsilon_{12}-\varepsilon_{14}-\varepsilon_{15})/2. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

This allows us to consider the elements of the set μ as independent variables.

4.2 Social optimality with quantum probabilities

Comparing the Table 1 with the Table 3, one notices that the players' types should correspond to the four directions D_1, D_1', D_2, and D_2' along which the measurements are performed in the EPR experiments. We thus associate Alice's first type to the direction D_1, Alice's second type to the direction D_2, Bob's first type to the direction D_1', and Bob's second type to the direction D_2'.

With these associations, in a run, each of the two directions D_1 and D_2 is chosen with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. Similarly, each of the two directions D_1' and D_2' are chosen with the probability $\frac{1}{2}$.

This can also be justified as within the considered game the two types of each player appear with the probability $\frac{1}{2}$ which is same as the probability of selecting between one of the two available directions for each player in the generalized EPR experiments. As EPR probabilities can become non-factorizable, it thus motivates investigating how the outcome of the Bayesian game is affected.

Consider the Table 3 where, for instance, when it is the interaction between Alice's type 2 and Bob of type 1, and the Stern-Gerlach detectors are rotated along these directions, the probability that both experimental outcomes are -1 is ε_{12} and the probability that the observer 1's experimental outcome is $+1$ and observer 2's experimental outcome is -1 is given by ε_{10}. The other entries in the Table 3 can similarly be explained.

Relevant to the EPR setting is the CHSH (Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt) form of Bell's inequality that is usually expressed in terms of the correlations $\langle D_1 D_1' \rangle$, $\langle D_1 D_2' \rangle$, $\langle D_2 D_1' \rangle$, $\langle D_2 D_2' \rangle$. Using the Table 3 the correlation $\langle D_1 D_1' \rangle$, for instance, can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D_1 D_1' \rangle &= \Pr(D_1 = 1, D_1' = 1) - \Pr(D_1 = 1, D_1' = -1) \\ &- \Pr(D_1 = -1, D_1' = +1) + \Pr(D_1 = -1, D_1' = -1) \\ &= \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3 + \epsilon_4. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Expressions for the correlations $\langle D_1 D_2' \rangle$, $\langle D_2 D_1' \rangle$, and $\langle D_2 D_2' \rangle$ can similarly be obtained. The CHSH sum of correlations is given as

$$\Delta = \langle D_1 D_1' \rangle + \langle D_1 D_2' \rangle + \langle D_2 D_1' \rangle - \langle D_2 D_2' \rangle \,, \tag{18}$$

and the CHSH inequality stating that $|\Delta| \leq 2$ holds for any theory of local hidden variables.

The set of constraints on probabilities ϵ_i that are imposed by Tsirelson's bound [80] state that the quantum prediction of the CHSH sum of correlations Δ, defined in (18), is bounded in absolute value by $2\sqrt{2}$ i.e. $|\Delta_{QM}| \leq 2\sqrt{2}$. Taking into account [79] the normalization condition (14), the quantity Δ can equivalently be expressed as

$$\Delta = 2(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_4 + \epsilon_5 + \epsilon_8 + \epsilon_9 + \epsilon_{12} + \epsilon_{14} + \epsilon_{15} - 2). \tag{19}$$

We now refer to the payoffs given in Eqs. (4) and find that these can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pi_{\mathrm{A}_1}(\epsilon_i) = \tfrac{1}{2}[\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_4 + \epsilon_5 + \epsilon_8], \quad \Pi_{\mathrm{A}_2}(\epsilon_i) = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[\epsilon_9 + \epsilon_{12} + \epsilon_{14} + \epsilon_{15}\right], \\ &\Pi_{\mathrm{B}_1}(\epsilon_i) = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_4 + \epsilon_9 + \epsilon_{12}\right], \quad \Pi_{\mathrm{B}_2}(\epsilon_i) = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[\epsilon_5 + \epsilon_8 + \epsilon_{14} + \epsilon_{15}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Note that the payoffs (20) are reduced to the payoffs in the mixed-strategy game (3) when the probability set ε_j $(1 \leq j \leq 16)$ is factorizable in terms of the probabilities p, q, p', $q' \in [0, 1]$ as given by Eqs. (5). The sum of the players' payoffs thus becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(\epsilon_i) &= \Pi_{\mathrm{A}_1}(\epsilon_i) + \Pi_{\mathrm{A}_2}(\epsilon_i) + \Pi_{\mathrm{B}_1}(\epsilon_i) + \Pi_{\mathrm{B}_2}(\epsilon_i) \\ &= (\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_4 + \epsilon_5 + \epsilon_8 + \epsilon_9 + \epsilon_{12} + \epsilon_{14} + \epsilon_{15}) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Using Eq. (19) we, therefore, obtain

$$\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(\epsilon_i) = \tfrac{\Delta}{2} + 2, \tag{22}$$

and, as the CHSH form of Bell's inequality is $|\Delta| \leq 2$, the range of values for $\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(\epsilon_i)$ when CHSH version of Bell's inequality holds is

$$2 \leq |\Pi_{\mathrm{sum}}(\epsilon_i)| \leq 3. \tag{23}$$

With the underlying EPR quantum probabilities, the socially optimal outcome of the game is obtained when $\Pi_{\rm sum}(\epsilon_i)$ is maximized, which is now bounded in by a different absolute value i.e.

$$2 \leq |\Pi_{\rm sum}(\epsilon_i)| \leq (2+\sqrt{2}) = 3.414. \tag{24}$$

We note that this sum exceeds the sum of $\frac{5}{2}$ for the 'non-edge' solution $(p^*, q^*; p'^*, q'^*) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$ of the socially optimal outcome in the Bayesian game with factorizable probabilities. It also exceeds the 'edge solution' $(p, q; p', q') = (0, 0; 0, 0)$ at which this sum is 3. However, it is less than the other 'edge solution' of $(p, q; p', q') = (1, 1; 1, 1)$ at which the sum is 4.

5 Discussion

We study the game-theoretic solution concept of social optimality in a Bayesian game when the underlying probabilities are obtained from generalized EPR experiments. In a Pareto optimal solution the players cannot change their choices so as to make one better off while leaving the other at least as good. A socially efficient outcome is a set of choices that maximizes the sum of the two players' payoffs. A socially efficient outcome is always a Pareto optimum, i.e. it is not possible to make one player better off without also making the other player worse off. Social optimality is thus a refinement on the set of Pareto-optimal outcomes and consists of the set of players' strategies that maximizes the sum of their payoffs.

For generalized EPR experiments, CHSH form of Bell's inequality can be expressed as a constraint on the absolute value of Δ as defined in Eq. (19) in terms of the joint probabilities ε_j $(1 \leq j \leq 16)$. For the Bayesian game studied in this paper, we find that when the underlying probabilities are obtained from generalized EPR experiments, the sum of the players' payoffs becomes directly proportional to Δ. This allows us to observe the effect of violation CHSH form of Bell's inequality on the socially optimal outcome of the game.

We find that with the underlying probabilities being quantum mechanical, a new socially optimal outcome is obtained for which the maximum of the sum of players' payoffs exceeds such maximum for factorizable probabilities while excluding the edge solutions. However, we also note that the edge solutions for the factorizable case can still exceed the quantum non-edge solution. Although the quantum set up is different in this paper, one might argue that the result developed has direct parallels with the work that is reported in Ref. [44].

From the words 'Bayesian' and 'quantum' one can imply the quantum Bayesian program of Caves, Fuchs, and Schack [81] aiming to interpret quantum probabilities as Bayesian probabilities. In this paper, our aim, however, is different and consists of showing that Bayesian games provide the appropriate setting where the role of quantum probabilities can be demonstrated directly and also without recourse to the mathematical formalism of quantum mechanics.

References

[1] Meyer, D. A., Quantum strategies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82,** 1052 (1999).

[2] Eisert, J., Wilkens, M., and Lewenstein, M., Quantum games and quantum strategies, *Phy. Rev. Lett.* **83,** 3077 (1999).

[3] Eisert, J., Wilkens, M., Quantum games, *J. Mod. Opt.* **47,** 2543 (2000).

[4] Vaidman, L., Variations on the theme of the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger proof, *Found. Phys.* **29**, 615-630 (1999).

[5] Benjamin, S. C., and Hayden, P. M., Comment on "Quantum games and quantum strategies", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87,** 069801 (2001).

[6] van Enk, S. J., Pike, R., Classical rules in quantum games, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 024306 (2002).

[7] Johnson, N. F., Playing a quantum game with a corrupted source, *Phys. Rev. A* **63,** 020302 (2001).

[8] Marinatto, L., Weber, T., A quantum approach to static games of complete information, *Phys. Lett. A* **272,** 291-303 (2000).

[9] Iqbal, A., Toor, A. H., Evolutionarily stable strategies in quantum games, *Phys. Lett. A* **280**, 249-256 (2001).

[10] Du, J., Li, H., Xu, X., Zhou, X., and Han, R., Entanglement enhanced multiplayer quantum games, *Phys. Lett. A* **302,** 229-233 (2002).

[11] Du, J., Li, H., Xu, X., Shi, M., Wu, J., Zhou, X., and Han, R., Experimental realization of quantum games on a quantum computer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88,** 137902 (2002).

[12] Piotrowski, E. W., Sladkowski, J., Quantum market games, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **312,** 208-216 (2002).

[13] Iqbal, A., Toor, A. H., Quantum cooperative games, *Phys. Lett. A* **293,** 103-108 (2002).

[14] Flitney, A. P., Abbott, D., An introduction to quantum game theory, *Fluct. Noise Lett.* **2,** R175-R187 (2002).

[15] Iqbal, A., Toor, A. H., Quantum mechanics gives stability to a Nash equilibrium, *Phys. Rev. A* **65,** 022306 (2002).

[16] Piotrowski, E. W., Sladkowski, J., An invitation to quantum game theory, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **42,** 1089-1099 (2003).

[17] Shimamura, J., Özdemir, S.K., Morikoshi, F., and Imoto, N., Entangled states that cannot reproduce original classical games in their quantum version, *Phys. Lett. A* **328**, 20-25 (2004).

[18] Flitney, A. P., and Abbott, D., Quantum games with decoherence, *J. Phys. A: Math. & Gen.* **38,** 449-459 (2005).

[19] Du, J., Li, H., Xu, X., Zhou, X., Han, R., Multi-player and multi-choice quantum game, *Chinese Phys. Lett.* **19**, 1221-1224 (2002).

[20] Han, Y. J., Zhang, Y. S., Guo, G. C., W state and Greenberger–Horne–Zeilinger state in quantum three-person prisoner's dilemma, *Phys. Lett. A* **295**, 61-64 (2002).

[21] Iqbal, A., Weigert, S., Quantum correlation games, *J. Phys. A: Math. & Gen.* **37**, 5873-5885 (2004).

[22] Mendes, R., Quantum games and social norms: The quantum ultimatum game, *Quant. Infor. Process.* **4**, 1-12 (2005).

[23] Cheon, T., Tsutsui, I., Classical and quantum contents of solvable game theory on Hilbert space, *Phys. Lett. A* **348,** 147-152 (2006).

[24] Iqbal, A., Playing games with EPR-type experiments, *J. Phys. A: Math. & Gen.* **38**, 9551-9564 (2005).

[25] Nawaz, A., and Toor, A.H., Generalized quantization scheme for two-person non-zero-sum games, *J. Phys. A, Math. Gen.* **37,** 11457-11463 (2004).

[26] Özdemir, S. K., Shimamura, J., Imoto, N., Quantum advantage does not survive in the presence of a corrupt source: optimal strategies in simultaneous move games, *Phys. Lett. A* **325**, 104-111 (2004).

[27] Cheon, T., Game theory formulated on Hilbert space, *AIP Conf. Proc.* Volume **864**, 254-260, *Quantum Computing: Back Action* (2006), Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur, India. Arxiv: quant ph/0605134

[28] Shimamura, J., Özdemir,S. K., Morikoshi, F., and Imoto, N., Quantum and classical correlations between players in game theory, *Int. J. Quant. Inf.* **2**, 79-89 (2004).

[29] Chen, Q., Wang, Y., Liu, J. T., and Wang, K. L., N-player quantum minority game, *Phys. Lett. A* **327,** 98-102 (2004).

[30] Schmid, C., Flitney, A. P., Wieczorek, W. Kiesel, N., Weinfurter, H., and Hollenberg, L. C. L., Experimental implementation of a four-player quantum game, *New J. Phys.* **12**, 063031 (2010).

[31] Ichikawa, T., and Tsutsui, I., Duality, phase structures, and dilemmas in symmetric quantum games, *Annals of Phys.* **322,** 531-551 (2007).

[32] Cheon, T., Iqbal, A., Bayesian Nash equilibria and Bell inequalities, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **77**, 024801 (2008).

[33] Özdemir, S. K., Shimamura, J., and Imoto, N., A necessary and sufficient condition to play games in quantum mechanical settings, *New J. Phys.* **9,** 43 (2007).

[34] Flitney, A. P., and Greentree, A. D., Coalitions in the quantum Minority game: Classical cheats and quantum bullies, *Phys. Lett. A* **362**, 132-137 (2007).

[35] Prevedel, R., Stefanov, A., Walther, P., and Zeilinger, A., Experimental realization of a quantum game on a one-way quantum computer, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 205 (2007).

[36] Iqbal, A., and Cheon, T., Constructing quantum games from nonfactorizable joint probabilities, *Phys. Rev. E* **76,** 061122 (2007).

[37] Ichikawa, T. Tsutsui, I., and Cheon, T., Quantum game theory based on the Schmidt decomposition, *J. Phys. A: Math. & Theor.* **41,** 135303 (2008).

[38] Ramzan. M., Khan, M. K., Noise effects in a three-player Prisoner's Dilemma quantum game, *J. Phys. A, Math. Theor.* **41**, 435302 (2008).

[39] Flitney, A. P., Hollenberg, L. C. L., Nash equilibria in quantum games with generalized two-parameter strategies, *Phys. Lett. A* **363,** 381-388 (2007).

[40] Aharon, N., Vaidman, L., Quantum advantages in classically defined tasks, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 052310 (2008).

[41] Bleiler, S. A., A formalism for quantum games and an application, arXiv:0808.1389.

[42] Ahmed, A., Bleiler, S., Khan, F. S., Octonionization of three player, two strategy maximally entangled quantum games, *Int. J. Quant. Inform.* **8**, 411-434 (2010).

[43] Li, Q., He, Y., Jiang, J. P., A novel clustering algorithm based on quantum games, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **42**, 445303 (2009).

[44] Flitney, A.P., Schlosshauer, M., Schmid, C., Laskowski, W., Hollenberg, L.C.L., Equivalence between violations of the Bell inequality and optimal payoffs in a quantum minority game, *Phys. Lett. A* **373**, 521-524 (2009).

[45] Li, Q., Iqbal, A., Chen, M., Abbott, D., Quantum strategies win in a defector-dominated population, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **391**, 3316-3322 (2012).

[46] Chappell, J. M., Iqbal, A., Abbott, D., Constructing quantum games from symmetric nonfactorizable joint probabilities, *Phys. Lett. A* **374**, 4104-4111 (2010).

[47] Chappell, J. M., Iqbal, A., Abbott, D., Analyzing three player quantum games in an EPR type setup, *PLOSONE* **6**, e21623 (2011).

[48] Iqbal, A., Abbott, D., Quantum matching pennies game, *J. Phy. Soc. Jpn.* **78**, 014803 (2009).

[49] Chappell, J. M., Iqbal, A., Lohe, M.A., von Smekal, L., An analysis of the quantum penny flip game using geometric algebra, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **78**, 054801 (2009).

[50] Iqbal, A., Cheon, T., Abbott, D., Probabilistic analysis of three-player symmetric quantum games played using the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm setting, *Phys. Lett. A* **372**, 6564-6577 (2008).

[51] Kolenderski, P., Sinha, U., Youning, L., Zhao, T., Volpini, M., Cabello, A., Laflamme, R., Jennewein, T., Aharon-Vaidman quantum game with a Young-type photonic qutrit, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 012321 (2012).

[52] Chappell, J. M., Iqbal, A., Abbott, D., Analysis of two-player quantum games in an EPR setting using geometric algebra, *PLOSONE* **7**, e29015 (2012).

[53] Chappell, J. M., Iqbal, A., Abbott, D., N-player quantum games in an EPR setting, *PLOSONE* **7**, e36404 (2012).

[54] Pawela, Ł., Sładkowski, J., Quantum Prisoner's Dilemma game on hypergraph networks, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **392**, 910-917 (2013).

[55] Pawela, Ł, Sładkowski, J., Cooperative quantum Parrondo's games, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **256–257**, 51-57 (2013).

[56] Brunner, N., Linden, N., Connection between Bell nonlocality and Bayesian game theory, *Nature Communications* **4**, Art. No. 2057 (2013).

[57] Frackiewicz, P., A new model for quantum games based on the Marinatto-Weber approach, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **46**, 275301 (2013).

[58] Li, Q., Chen, M., Perc, M., Iqbal, A., and Abbott, D., Effects of adaptive degrees of trust on coevolution of quantum strategies on scale-free networks, *Scientific Reports* **3**, 2949 (2013).

[59] Li, Q., Iqbal, A., Perc, M., Chen, M., and Abbott, D., Coevolution of quantum and classical strategies on evolving random networks, *PLOSONE* **8**/7, e68423 (2013).

[60] Iqbal, A., Chappell, J. M., Li, Q., Pearce, Charles E. M., Abbott, D., A probabilistic approach to quantum Bayesian games of incomplete information, *Q. Inf. Process.* **13**, 2783-2800 (2014).

[61] Ramanathan, R., Kay, A., Murta, G., and Horodecki, P., Characterizing the performance of XOR games and the Shannon capacity of graphs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 240401 (2014).

[62] Buscemi, F., Datta, N., Strelchuk, S., Game-theoretic characterization of antidegradable channels, *J. Math. Phys.* **55**, 092202 (2014)

[63] Muhammad, S., Tavakoli, A., Kurant, M., Pawlowski, M., Zukowski, M., Bourennane, M., Quantum bidding in Bridge, *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 021047 (2014).

[64] Bolonek-Lasoń, K., General quantum two-player games, their gate operators, and Nash equilibria, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys., 023A03 (2015).

[65] Perc, M., Szolnoki, A., Coevolutionary games—A mini review, *BioSystems* **99**, 109–125 (2010).

[66] Binmore, K., *Game Theory: A Very Short Introduction* Oxford University Press, USA, (2007).

[67] Rasmusen, E., *Games & Information*: *An Introduction to Game Theory,* Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Oxford, (2001) 3rd Edition.

[68] Osborne, M. J., *An Introduction to Game Theory*, Oxford University Press, USA (2003).

[69] See for example, Section 4.3 in Binmore, K., *Just Playing: Game Theory and the Social Contract* II, ISBN 0-262-02444-6, MIT (1998).

[70] Peres, A., *Quantum Theory*: *Concepts and Methods,* Kluwer Academic Publishers (1995).

[71] Einstein, A., Podolsky, B., and Rosen, N., Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?, *Phys. Rev.* **47** (1935) 777.

[72] Bohm, D., *Quantum Theory*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., (1951).

[73] Bell, J. S., On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox, *Physics* **1,** 195 (1964).

[74] Bell, J. S., *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1987).

[75] Bell, J. S., On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38** (1966) 447.

[76] Aspect, A., Dalibard, J., and Roger, G., Experimental test of Bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49,** 1804 (1982).

[77] Clauser J. F., and Shimony, A., Bell's theorem. Experimental tests and implications, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **41,** 1881 (1978).

[78] Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A., and Holt, R. A., Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969).

[79] Cereceda, J. L., Quantum mechanical probabilities and general probabilistic constraints for Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm experiments, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **13**, 427 (2000).

[80] Cirel'son, B. S., Quantum generalizations of Bell's inequality, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **4**, 93 (1980).

[81] Caves, C. M., Fuchs, C. A., Schack, R., Quantum probabilities as Bayesian probabilities, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 022305 (2002).